

REMARKS

The Examiner's comments together with the cited references have been carefully studied. Favorable reconsideration in view of the foregoing amendments and following remarks is respectfully requested.

Claims 1, 2, 5, 6, and 8 are pending in the application. Claims 1, 2, and 8 have been rejected. Claims 5 and 6 are objected to. Both claims 1 and 8 have been amended to improve their clarity.

Applicants thank the Examiner for the indication of allowable subject matter.

Claims 1, 2, and 8 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Abe et al. (2003/0122759) in view of Sekiya et al. (US 6,583,775). By this amendment, independent claim 1 has been amended to clearly set forth that it is the contrast and brightness setting values which are separate from the image data (FIG. 3), not the means of supplying the values. Moreover, the claim has been amended to clearly point out that the active-matrix OLED display panel includes a display and circuitry for providing current to each pixel in accordance with the separately-provided contrast and brightness setting values and the supplied image data. An advantage of this arrangement is the fact that the display settings for contrast and brightness are used along with the image data to provide an enhanced digital image.

Turning to Abe et al. FIG. 26, an image signal ("HD YPbPr") is inputted to a synchronization signal separation circuit 3, an RGB conversion part 7 and a selector 23 that provide RGB image data (paragraphs 405–409). This RGB image data corresponds to the image data of claim 1. The only other input to the structure of FIG. 26 is a VGA select input to the selector 23 which is a simple multiplexor (para. 409). Neither the image signal nor the VGA select input correspond to the separately-provided contrast and brightness setting values. The examiner has indicated that the line extending into 200 of FIG. 26 of Abe corresponds to the means for supplying setting values. Applicants believe that claim 1, as amended, clearly indicates that the setting values must be provided separately from the image data, not derived from the image data as Abe 200. For example, the means for supplying contrast and brightness setting values can include user input (para. 34)

or control by a CPU (FIG. 5 24; para. 44). Abe has no teaching, suggestion or motivation for externally providing these values rather than deriving them from the input data stream.

By making use of these setting values in combination with the image data, Applicants' circuitry can drive current through the pixels that will produce an enhanced image on the display with increased flexibility and user control of the display. Nothing in Abe et al. discloses or suggests any motivation for providing separate contrast and brightness setting values as in claim 1 of the present invention.

As previously pointed out in the amendment dated Nov. 19, 2007, Applicants assume that the Abe device is a plasma device. At the outset, Abe is passive-matrix and not OLED. Abe's system is to compensate for voltage drop across a row, as shown in Abe FIGS. 5A–5C. Abe calculates an estimated voltage drop for each element in the row and adds additional data voltage to correct for the calculated voltage drop.

The present invention solves a different problem. As amended, the display setting circuitry sets contrast and brightness based on supplied contrast and brightness setting values, which Abe does not need. The current control circuitry of claim 1 uses the panel current estimated by the estimation circuitry and corrects the supplied contrast or brightness based on the panel current estimate.


Sekiya et al. was also used in the rejection of claim 1. It is true that Sekiya et al. have a general disclosure of an active-matrix OLED device. However, Sekiya et al. is directed to brightness adjustments and not to nonuniformity compensation as required to claim 1. Applicants believe there is no teaching, suggestion, reason or motivation to combine the device of Abe with that of Sekiya et al., as Abe solves a different problem, as described above. Even if Abe and Sekiya et al. could be combined, Applicants believe that combination does not suggest the present invention.

Accordingly, amended claim 1 is believed to define unobvious subject matter over Abe taken singly or in combination with Sekiya et al. and its allowance is urged.

The remaining claims depend upon claim 1 and should be allowed with it.

Should the Examiner consider that additional amendments are necessary to place the application in condition for allowance, the favor is requested of a telephone call to the undersigned counsel for the purpose of discussing such amendments.

Respectfully submitted,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'Raymond L. Owens', is written over a horizontal line.

Raymond L. Owens
Attorney for Applicant(s)
Registration No. 22,363

RLO:
Rochester, NY 14650
Telephone: (585) 477-4653
Facsimile: (585) 477-4646

If the Examiner is unable to reach the Applicant(s) Attorney at the telephone number provided, the Examiner is requested to communicate with Eastman Kodak Company Patent Operations at (585) 477-4656.